Response to Restriction Requirement Mailed December 12, 2008 Appl. 10/568,303 Art Unit 1626

Remarks/Arguments:

A. Status of the Claims

Claims 75 and 98-99 are amended. Claims 1-74 and 86-102 are withdrawn from consideration at this time. Therefore, claims 75-85 are pending, with claims 1-74 and 86-102 being withdrawn from consideration at this time.

B. Summary of Telephonic Interview

Examiner Young and Applicant's representative, Michael R. Krawzsenek, conducted a telephonic interview on May 29, 2008. The substance of the Restriction Requirement was discussed. In particular, Applicant's representative was concerned that the Restriction Requirement could potentially be read as requiring Applicant to elect a single compound which would require Applicant to file several hundred divisional applications. Examiner Young was concerned that there was a serious burden to search the full scope of the subject matter in claims 1-102. In response, Applicant suggested that it would elect Group V, in part, without traverse, revise claim 75 to narrow its scope, and to focus the Group V claims on claims 75, 76, 80, and 83 (and corresponding dependent claims) in an effort to reduce Examiner's search burden. Examiner Young indicated that she would consider these amendments and substantively examine the claims. Examiner Young also indicated that if the search results were too numerous, she would contact Applicant's representative to discuss the possibility of further narrowing the scope of claims.

Examiner Young is invited to contact Applicant's representative at 512-536-3020 if further clarification of the above-summary is needed.

C. Applicant's Election

Applicant elects Group V with the understanding that the full-scope of claims 75-85 as currently amended above will be searched. Applicant also notes that claim 75 is now directed to a polymer comprising the reaction product of a compound selected from the group consisting of:

$$0 \xrightarrow{R_1} 0 \xrightarrow{R_1} 0 \xrightarrow{R_1} C_N \xrightarrow{R_1} C_N$$

and optionally 2,5-dioctyloxy-1,4-diformylbenzene.

Applicant respectfully takes the position that claim 75 can be searched without unduly burdening the Examiner. For instance, the five (5) compounds above are all 2-7 difunctionalized carbazoles. The carbazole core structure is also present in claims 76-85. Therefore, the search can be formulated around this core structure to identify any prior art that concerns a polymer that includes the reaction product of the above five (5) compounds without serious burden.

Applicant reserves the right to reintroduce the subject matter of claims 98-102 upon the allowance of claim 75 pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.121.

Response to Restriction Requirement Mailed December 12, 2008 Appl. 10/568,303 Art Unit 1626

D. Conclusion

Applicant requests that substantive examination begin for claims 75-85. Should the Examiner have any questions, comments, or suggestions relating to this case, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned Applicants' representative at (512) 5 3020.

Michael R. Krawzsenek Reg. No. 51,898 Attorney for Applicants

Respectfully

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P. 600 Congress Avenue, Suite 2400 Austin, Texas 78701 (512) 536-3020 (512) 536-4598 (facsimile)

Date: June 4, 2008